United States District Court

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

ANTONIO NORMAN	Case Number:	1:08-CR-286	

ANT	ON	IO NORMAN	Case Number: <u>1:08-CR-286</u>
require	In ac	ccordance with the Bail Reform Act, detention of the defendant pending	B U.S.C.§3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts rial in this case.
			Part I - Findings of Fact
	(1)	The defendant is charged with a offense) (state or local offense that existed) that is	offense described in 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a (federal would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had
		a crime of violence as define	in 18 U.S.C.§3156(a)(4).
		an offense for which the max	mum sentence is life imprisonment or death.
		an offense for which the ma	imum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in
		a felony that was committed a U.S.C.§3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or	ter the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 omparable state or local offenses.
	(2)		as committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local
	(3)	offense. A period of not more than five years the offense described in finding (1).	as elapsed since the (date of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for
	(4)	Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establiassure the safety of (an)other pe	n a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably son(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this
		presumption.	Alternate Findings (A)
X	(1)	There is probable cause to believe	hat the defendant has committed an offense
		for which a maximum term of under 18 U.S.C.§924(c).	imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in 21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq
X	(2)	The defendant has not rebutted the reasonably assure the appearance	presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.
_			Alternate Findings (B)
	(1)	There is a serious risk that the defe	
X	(2)	There is a serious risk that the defe	ndant will endanger the safety of another person or the community.
			esident of Kalamazoo, MI, who is an admitted drug dealer and who has used cocaine y began experimenting with ecstacy. He has held no meaningful employment in recent
		drugs and sent to prison. He was s	cord dating back to the early 1990's when he was convicted of delivery/manufacture of absequently convicted of interfering with the police (3 occasions), (see next page)
		Part II - Wri	ten Statement of Reasons for Detention
that t	he cı	redible testimony and informatio	submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence that
ealing s brotl	and her,	other unlawful behavior, based where he represented to Pretrial	will assure the safety of the community from the defendant's continued drug con the unrebutted presumption. The mere fact that the defendant can live with Services he has been living for the past 2 1/2 years while getting into trouble, d finding employment, or the representation that his wife, (see next page)
		Part I	I - Directions Regarding Detention
etendar on rec	nt sha quest	all be afforded a reasonable opportu t of an attorney for the Government	the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a correction persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The ity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United State the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United in connection with a court proceeding.
Dated:	No	ovember 26, 2008	/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr.
atou.		,	Signature of Judicial Officer
			Hugh W. Brenneman, United States Magistrate Judge
			Name and Title of Judicial Officer

United States v. **ANTONIO NORMAN** 1:08-CR-286

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

Page 2.

Alternate Findings (B) - (continued)

malicious destruction of property, OUIL, and delivery and manufacture of narcotics. As a habitual offender, he was placed on lifetime probation, during which he failed to report on several occasions, failed to provide a drug test as required, failed to report a police contact, and was convicted of driving while license suspended (on at least 4 occasions) and domestic violence. He was removed from lifetime probation in 2004, when the legislature abolished lifetime probation.

On March 6, 2001, defendant failed to appear for an arraignment.

Since being released from lifetime probation, defendant was subsequently convicted of possession of narcotics less than 25 grams, failed to appear for a conference on January 13, 2006, resulting in a bench warrant being issued, and more recently was found guilty of a violation of a restricted license.

Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention - (continued)

whom he does not live with (he apparently lives with a girlfriend who has had four children by him and is pregnant with another), could "supervise him" if he lived in the neighborhood, fails to provide the court with anything to rebut the presumption.